1994, as supplemented on January 13, 1995, and February 3, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time interval extension for the Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) by approximately 24 months from the February 1995 refueling outage to the February 1997 refueling outage would be granted.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the Type A test from the February 1995 refueling outage, to the February 1997 refueling outage, thereby saving the cost of performing the test and eliminating the test period from the critical path time of the outage.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at IP2 to show good containment performance and will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests which historically have been shown to be the principal means of detecting containment leakage paths with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. It is also noted that the licensee, as a condition of the proposed exemption, will perform the visual containment inspection although it is only required by Appendix J to be conducted in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. The NRC staff also notes that the IP2 Containment Penetration and Weld Channel Pressurization System provides a means for continuously monitoring potential containment leakage paths during power operation. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the NRC staff consulted with the New York State official regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated September 19, 1994, as supplemented by letters dated January 13, 1995, and February 3, 1995, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the White Plains Public Library, 100 Martine Avenue, White Plains, New York 10610

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of March 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Ledyard B. Marsh,

Director, Project Directorate I–1, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–5612 Filed 3–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–344]

Portland General Electric Co., Receipt of Decommissioning Plan and Decommissioning Environmental Report and Opportunity for Public Comments; Trojan Nuclear Power Plant

By letter January 26, 1995, Portland General Electric Company (PGE or the licensee) submitted the Decommissioning Plan and a supplement to the Environmental Report describing the decommissioning of the Trojan Nuclear Plant (Trojan or the plant). The licensee is the holder of Facility Operating License No. NFP–1 that was issued on November 21, 1975. The permanently shut down nuclear plant is located on the west shore of the Columbia River in Columbia County, Oregon.

Pursuant to the 10 CFR 50.82(e) the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is providing this notice to interested persons prior to approval of the Decommissioning Plan. The Decommissioning Plan does not contain any requests for amendments to the Trojan Operating License. Therefore, an opportunity for a hearing under 10 CFR part 2 of Commission regulations, is not being offered by this notice. Should the Commission determine that a license amendment is necessary in connection with the proposed Decommissioning Plan, that action will be noticed separately.

Interested persons are invited to submit written comments or questions on the Decommissioning Plan or Environmental Report. Any written comments should be limited to the contents of the Decommissioning Plan and Environmental Report.

The staff will review and consider all comments that are received before taking final action on the proposed Decommissioning Plan. Written comments should be submitted within 120 days of the publication date of this notice and addressed to: Michael T. Masnik, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

In addition, the NRC is planning to hold a joint public meeting with the Oregon Department of Energy (ODOE) on Wednesday, March 29, 1995, at the St. Helens High School, U.S. Highway

30 and Gable Road, St. Helens, Oregon. The meeting will begin at 7:30 pm and will last approximately two hours. The purpose of the meeting is to provide the NRC and the ODOE an opportunity to explain their respective decommissioning review processes and to provide interested members of the public an opportunity to ask questions and provide comments on the decommissioning of the Trojan plant.

Copies of the Decommissioning Plan and Environmental Report are available at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555, and at the Local Public Document Room located on the fifth floor of the Branford Price Millar Library, Portland State University, 934 S.W. Harrison Street, P.O. Box 1151, Portland, Oregon 97207.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Seymour H. Weiss,

Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–5613 Filed 3–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Regulatory Guide; Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued a new guide in its Regulatory Guide Series. This series has been developed to describe and make available to the public such information as methods acceptable to the NRC staff for implementing specific parts of the Commission's regulations, techniques used by the staff in evaluating specific problems or postulated accidents, and data needed by the staff in its review of applications for permits and licenses.

Regulatory Guide 6.9, ''Establishing Quality Assurance Programs for the Manufacture and Distribution of Sealed Sources and Devices Containing Byproduct Material,'' provides guidance acceptable to the NRC staff on the essential elements needed to develop, establish, and maintain a quality assurance program for the manufacture and distribution of sealed sources and devices.

Comments and suggestions in connection with items for inclusion in guides currently being developed or improvements in all published guides are encouraged at any time. Written comments may be submitted to the Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Regulatory guides are available for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC. Copies of issued guides may be purchased from the Government Printing Office at the current GPO price. Information on current GPO prices may be obtained by contacting the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Post Office Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082, telephone (202) 512–2249. Issued guides may also be purchased from the National Technical Information Service on a standing order basis. Details on this service may be obtained by writing NTIS, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161.

(5 U.S.C. 552(a))

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Eric S. Beckjord,

Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 95–5609 Filed 3–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–318]

Baltimore Gas and Electric Co.; Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–69 issued to Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (the licensee) for operation of the Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit No. 2, located in Calvert County, Maryland.

The proposed amendment would revise the Calvert Cliffs, Unit No. 2, Technical Specifications (TSs). Specifically, TS 4.G.1.2 would reference 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J directly, and any approved exemptions to the Type A testing frequently requirements, rather than paraphrase the regulation. The proposed wording is consistent with that used in NUREG–1432, ''Standard Technical Specifications—Combustion Engineering Plants,'' dated September 1992.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed change revises Technical Specification 4.6.1.2.a to reference the testing frequency requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J, and to state that NRC-approved exemptions to the applicable regulatory requirements are permitted. The current Technical Specification 4.6.1.2.a paraphrases the requirements of Appendix J, paragraph III.D.1.(a) and necessitates a change to the Technical Specifications should the Appendix J language change or an exemption be granted. The proposed administrative revision simply deletes the paraphrased language and directly references Appendix J and any approved exemptions. No new requirements are added, nor are any existing requirements deleted. Any specific exemptions from the requirements of Appendix J, paragraph III.D.1.(a) will continue to require a submittal from Baltimore Gas and Electric Company under 10 CFR 50.12 and subsequent review and approval by the NRC prior to implementation.

The proposed change will provide a one-time exemption from the 10 CFR part 50, Appendix J, paragraph III.D.1.(a) leak rate test schedule requirement. This change will allow for a one-time interval between subsequent Type A test of approximately 72 months. It will also extend the second ten-year Type A testing service period to 12 years to coincide with the inservice inspection interval.

No physical or operational changes to the structure, plant systems or components would be made as a result of the proposed change. Furthermore, leak rate testing is not an initiating event in any accident, therefore this proposed change does not involve a significant increase in the probability of any accident previously evaluated.

Type A tests are capable of detecting containment leaks through containment penetrations and through the containment liner. The history at Calvert Cliffs Unit 2 demonstrates that Type B and C Local Leak Rate Tests (LLRTs) have consistently detected leakage through penetrations. With the exception of the first periodic Unit 2 Type A test in 1979, which failed and was promptly corrected, Type A tests have not